

Ljubiša R. Mitrović.¹
University of Niš,
Faculty of Philosophy,
Department of Sociology
Niš (Serbia)

Dunja Z. Veličković²
University of Niš,
Innovation Centre
Niš (Serbia)

**ĐORĐE TASIĆ ON SOCIOLOGY AS A SCIENCE
AND THE MISSION OF THE JOURNAL *SOCIOLOŠKI
PREGLED / SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW*
IN THE PERIOD 1938-2020**

ABSTRACT: The paper first points out the importance of studying scientific heritage in sociology in our country. The focus of the author's considerations is the pioneering contribution of Đorđe Tasić to the foundation of the Serbian Sociological Society, the initiation and editing of the journal *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review*, as well as the elaboration of the basic questions from General Systematic Sociology. The central place in the analysis is the research of the mission of the journal *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* in the context of the social and time manner in the period 1938-2020. An attempt was made to detect the informative, cognitive, pedagogical, cultural and social role of the journal both in the sociological academic community and in society.

KEYWORDS: Đorđe Tasić, sociology in Serbia, *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review*, journal's mission statement.

¹ ljubisa.mitrovic@filfak.ni.ac.rs

² velickovicdunja@gmail.com

For us, sociology is our awareness of ourselves, the most complete, the most comprehensive, the truest and the richest. It also becomes our conscience for us.

(Đorđe Tasić et al. (1938: 4)³

The Sociological Society, the Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review and the Institute for Sociology, which are all Đorđe Tasić's creations, represent the pinnacle of the pre-war development of sociology not only in Serbia but also in entire former Yugoslavia.

(Antonić, 2018: 13)

INTRODUCTION: ON THE IMPORTANCE OF STUDYING SCIENTIFIC HERITAGE IN SOCIOLOGY IN OUR COUNTRY

The legend says that the butterfly knows no time, lives for one day and has no memory of its yesterday, i.e., its past. Therefore, the butterfly lives from the beauty of the moment, in the twinkle of the present. Unlike it, man, as a species of *Homo sapiens*, has a multidimensional identity whose essential element is contained in the culture of memory, in the collective memory of people and humanity. That is why man is torn between different times: past, present and future. Hence, if individuals or groups do not learn from the past, they will be punished by the future (Zarathustra). Contemporary futurologist John Naisbitt, on the other hand, conveys the message to the new generation not to live in the shadow of the past but to learn from the challenges of the megatrends of the future. The question is how to navigate between these different instructions and messages.

Despite the philosophy of presentism and postmodern relativity in modern times, we must not forget the historical dimension of the social phenomena, be it about the life and role of an individual/personality, group or institution. All traces of their work and life span, ups and downs should be researched, valorized through the "sieve of time" and then one should find the living seed to cultivate the field of the present and the future. In that line, serious discussions and studies have been written in philosophy and sociological science about the relationship between philosophy and history, history and sociology. This is so because man and society are participants and actors in both fields and they significantly shape social phenomena and processes, the fate of social groups and individuals. Historical and social determinism are intertwined. Despite the Promethean power of man to turn fate into freedom and history, often the "cunning of the historical mind", according to Hegel, plays cruelly with nations and people, pushing them into tragic conflicts; so much so that their history sometimes appears in the form of tragedy and sometimes in the form of farce. That is why wise Hegel warns: "All that is mental is not real and all that is real is not mental; Minerva's owl takes off late, Truth is at

³ In the Editorial of the journal *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review*, which functions as a program manifesto.

the end of the road”. Great philosopher and poet Njegoš says that only “on the historical grid of time one can perceive what things belong to whom”; that is how the essence of the process, the scope and character of the effects are understood (of both individuals and groups, collectivities and institutions) in historical practice.

Sociology was born out of enthusiasm of the emancipatory spirit, but also out of the crisis of civil society, in search of an answer where and how to proceed. Saint Simon, delighted with his results in the elaboration of the science of society - sociology as a herald of the future, will exaltedly declare: “What a wonderful calling: working for the good of humanity”. His follower and secretary, Auguste Comte, will also seek in her not only the new queen of sciences, but a saving cognitive force in the search to resolve the crisis of the emerging civil society and its exit from the social turmoil in which, due to increasing contradictions, bourgeois society found itself in the 1850s. Karl Marx, with fewer Enlightenment illusions, obeying the law of class struggle and social revolution, offered his formula for the way out of the situations capitalism and humanity found themselves in.

Ever since then, sociology has developed all over the globe, passing through numerous stages: from the pioneering heroic age, through academic institutionalization and internationalization, differentiation into empirical and theoretical, experiencing its theoretical and methodological pluralization and affirmation as a science, vocation and profession. Today, 170 years since its establishment, sociology is a renowned science whose knowledge is important for the development of modern society.

In our region (Serbia and former Yugoslavia), sociology has a shorter history. Not underestimating the individual research contributions to this field of knowledge (at the end of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century: Vuk Karadžić, Svetozar Marković, Jovan Cvijić, Slobodan Jovanović, Tihomir Đorđević, Dragoljub Jovanović, Sreten Vukosavljević, Mirko Kosić and Đorđe Tasić), sociology was developed at the Faculty of Law in Belgrade in the 20th century. First, as a separate department and the first formed sociological scientific society, with its theoretical bulletin *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* (1938), whose first editor was Đorđe Tasić, Professor at the Faculty of Law in Belgrade. After the Second World War, in 1959, the study group for sociology was established at the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade, followed by those at the Faculty of Philosophy in Niš (1971) and Priština (after 2001: in Kosovska Mitrovica) and Novi Sad.

It could be pointed out that sociology in Serbia today has a significant tradition, scientific and educational academic heritage to be studied. Unfortunately, the course *History of Sociology in Serbia* has not yet been institutionalized in our sociology study groups. Apart from the few individuals who deal with this issue (Slobodan Antić, Milovan Mitrović, Jovica Trkulja), there are still no comprehensive monographic studies (see Lj. Mitrović, 2011; Lj. Mitrović, 2022).

The subject of our paper is Đorđe Tasić’s contribution to sociology as a science and the mission of the journal *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* in the period

1938-2020. The topic defined in this way requires the use of the content analysis as well as comparative-historical methods: in order to comprehend the role of this author as well as of the journal (founded by him) in the context of his work and understanding the complex relationships of creating and interweaving of the spirit of the society and the prevailing time. This is particularly important when considering the journal's mission as the mirror and the key of the encounter of history and creativity of different generations and editorial boards in the 82-year-long period.

I am convinced that the evaluation/overevaluation of the results of the journal *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* can be valuable not only for the history of the development of sociology in our country, but also for the further improvement of the policy and practice of editing the journal and its mission in meeting the new sociological generations whose time is coming. Therefore, we will finish our contribution with an overview: “*Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* with new tasks in store - a look into the future”.

ĐORĐE TASIĆ AND SOCIOLOGY IN SERBIA – A BRIEF REVIEW OF HIS WORK AND ACTIVITY

Đorđe Tasić is the doyen and precursor of our sociology, which he founded under the influence of Durkheim's sociology in France and wanted to form sociology of law following in the footsteps of Leon Duguit. Arriving at the Belgrade Faculty of Law (with a letter of recommendation from Slobodan Jovanović, who himself highly valued the role of sociological science (and made a significant contribution to political sociology and sociology of history in our country), Đorđe Tasić managed to initiate and realize several important projects: 1: the establishment of the Sociological Society; 2: the launching of the *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* in 1938, of which he was the first editor; 3: the establishment of the Institute of Sociology.

As concluded by colleague Antonić in the jubilee issues of *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review*, these three results represent the peak of the development of sociology, not only in Serbia but also in the entire Yugoslav territory (Antonić, 2018: 13). I would like to add that, even if he had not done anything else, our sociological academic community should owe its gratitude for this to Tasić. It should be noted, however, that this hard-working scientist engaged in the affirmation of the theoretical academic as well as empirical sociology because he knew how important its development was for our society. About this role of sociology, as an editor, he writes among other things: “*Sociology for us is our awareness of ourselves, the most complete, the most comprehensive, the truest and the richest. For us, it also becomes our conscience*” (Tasić et al, 1938: 4).

Within the framework of the newly formed Society of Sociology and Social Sciences and the Institute, Tasić initiated the research into the pressing problems of the Serbian village, for which he had the selfless support of Sreten Vukosavljević and Radomir Lukić,

who would become his closest collaborators. Under his influence Lukić would develop his interests in sociology of law, general sociology and rural sociology.

The newly formed Society of Sociology and Social Sciences will be completely committed to the popularization of sociology as a new academic discipline at the university: through the organization of public lectures but also regulation, i.e., introducing a new discipline into the curriculum. Of course, the centre/focal point of this influence was the Faculty of Law, where the first Department of Sociology and Statistics was established. It should be noted here that our most influential scientists - sociologists who were partly formed in France (Đorđe Tasić, Dragoljub Jovanović, Jovan Đorđević, Radomir Lukić) were employed at the Faculty of Law. Academician Slobodan Jovanović lent great understanding and support to the institutionalization of sociology in the study system, and was followed by Đorđe Tasić as well, who became the dean of this faculty.

Unfortunately, the whirlwind of war brought new tragic trials for the country, the people and the university. In the occupied country, under the pressure and influence of the Quisling government, the University of Belgrade was affected too. The Faculty of Law, headed by Dean Đorđe Tasić, refused to cooperate with the occupier just as legendary Hellenist Miloš Đurić refused to sign a petition in support of the occupation authorities: "I don't play the flute, I teach ethics; by protecting my honour, I protect the autonomy of the university and defend my own and my students' patriotic commitment". Precisely because of this refusal to cooperate with the occupation authorities, Tasić will find himself in prison, where he was executed by shooting in 1943. He left behind a comprehensive body of work: a sociology textbook for students had already been written, preparations for the new issue of the journal *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* had been completed, and the pioneering empirical research on the problems of our village had been initiated.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE JOURNAL *SOCIOLOŠKI PREGLED*
/ *SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW*, BOOK 1/1938 AS A NOTABLE
EXAMPLE OF HOW PERIODICALS SHOULD BE EDITED**

The first issue of the *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* on 436 pages is structured in the following way: a supplement to the Introduction as a program manifesto (written by Tasić on behalf of the Editorial Board), four thematic units: I Sociology and social crisis; II Development and contemporary state of sociology; III Means and teaching; IV Critical review of books and contributor summaries in French. Within the first thematic cycle, 17 articles were written by local authors, including Slobodan Jovanović, Siniša Stanković, Nikola Vučo, Dušan Popović, Jovan Đorđević, Božidar Marković and Đorđe Tasić. Within the second block, there were 8 contributions, 7 domestic and 1 foreign, while within the third cycle there were 7 contributions by domestic authors. As part of the critical review of books an extensive annotation of the foreign and domestic literature from sociology and other social sciences was given - a critical review of 129 books.

The first issue of the journal *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* deals with the place of sociology in the system of social sciences (the relationship between sociology and philosophy, history and sociology, biology and sociology, sociology and psychology, sociology and statistics, ethnology and sociology, sociology and economics, sociology and law, sociology and actions etc.). In the second block, the journal brings contributions about the contemporary course of sociology (in the USA, in France, in Russia, among Croats), a general overview of the development of our sociology, Slobodan Jovanović and sociology, Tihomir Đorđević from the point of view of sociology, Valtazar Bogišić's ideas about national and land law. The third part encompasses an overview of the sociological congresses in Paris in 1937, the development of Belgian sociology and the Solvay Institute of Sociology, social sciences at American universities, sociology teaching in France and sociology textbooks).

Đorđe Tasić published a total of 7 articles in the journal, all of them from sociology, and 39 reports, 11 of which are from sociology, and the rest from other social sciences. Tasić's contributions include the following fields: Philosophy and Sociology, Sociology and Action, General Conditions of Our Sociology and Our Social Sciences, On Belgian Sociology and the Publications of the Solvay Institute of Sociology, On Sociological Congresses in 1937 in Paris, About sociology teaching in France and about sociology textbooks. The first three contributions seem particularly significant to us because Tasić deals with determining the relationship between philosophy and sociology; then the importance of sociology for social action, as well as a presentation of the development of our sociology and other social sciences (through the analysis of the works of Vuk Karadžić, Svetozar Marković, Božidar Knežević, Jovan Cvijić, Slobodan Jovanović and Tihomir Đorđević – from the point of view of sociology). The author also emphasizes the contribution of his contemporaries in the development of sociology in our country: Mirko Kosić, Dragoljub Jovanović, Jovan Đorđević, Mihailo Avramović and Sreten Vukosavljević. Tasić defines sociology as a synthetic and empirical science which studies social life in its entirety (structure and dynamics of society). It is not the same as philosophy, which has a broader character. "Sociology as a science is called to pave the way both from hypocrisy and from resistance to conservatives and an authoritarian spirit, which does not tolerate any changes or criticism" (Tasić, 1938a: 170). The task of sociology, according to Tasić, is to investigate and find out natural social laws (that is, necessity) and enable predictions for the action of people/social groups in creating new society and new man (*Ibid.*: 172). All this shows that Tasić understood sociology as a theoretical-empirical science of society, which has a critical relationship with social reality, and the calling of a sociologist, as an engaged professional who participates in social changes with his knowledge.

It is interesting to see how the first issue of the journal was edited – with the active participation of all members of the Editorial Board and other collaborators from the country and abroad. Along with informing the general readership of what was happening in sociology in the world, there was also a practice of writing critical reviews, led particularly by the editor of the journal. In our country today, it is an underestimated

practice for which assistants are hired, although it is a very responsible job since the valorization of scientific papers often affects their reception by new generations.

Đorđe Tasić was not only a good organizer and editor of the newly launched journal, but also an author in the field of sociology, basing his orientation on Durkheim and his school of Durkheimian followers, as well as in philosophy and sociology of the state and law under the influence of Leon Duguit and Hans Kelsen. It could be said that this pioneer is also the founder of sociology of law in our country. He was a participant in many international scientific meetings and published his papers in foreign languages, especially in French. He always treated legal issues in the broader framework of history and sociology and even philosophy, thus showing, as Radomir Lukić emphasizes, that law cannot be studied in depth without considering a broad background (Lukić, 1992: 8). Lukić, undoubtedly most familiar with Tasić's creativity, writes, among other things: "We certainly had better stylists and indisputably better systematists in legal science (Slobodan Jovanović and Toma Živanović), but we did not have such a versatile, analytical, rich thinker as Đorđe Tasić". It is a tremendous loss for our science that at the age of 51 he gave his life for truth and freedom, at the time when he had reached full maturity and would undoubtedly have produced an abundant and significant range of works of a synthetic character" (*Ibidem*).

As far as I know, Tasić's work has been the main topic of several defended master's and doctoral dissertations, numerous articles and books in which his contribution to legal and sociological science is valued. It is the right decision of the management of the Serbian Sociological Society and the *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* to convene this scientific gathering and pay a tribute to this pioneer of sociology in our country and a true patriot.

ABOUT THE BALANCE OF ACTIVITIES OF THE JOURNAL *SOCIOLOŠKI PREGLED / SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW*

In this chapter, I will deal with the analysis of the content of the articles published in the journal, based on the published bibliography "*Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* 1938-2020", referring to them in the context of turning points in social changes in our country and worldwide - i.e., "social time" (as Gurvitch would define it) and "the spirit of the time" (E. Morin). In addition to considering the primary material in the analysis, I also used the results of other researchers in our country published in the *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* no. 1/2018, which is dedicated to the 80th anniversary of the establishment of the *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review*, with more than twenty author contributions,⁴ as well as the paper authored by Vladimir Vuletić and Dragan Stanojević. (2013). A comparative analysis was also included of the articles published in Serbia and Croatia, in the journals *Sociology*, *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review*

⁴ See the journal *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* 1/2018. Available at <https://scindeks.ceon.rs/issue.aspx?issue=13777> and <http://www.socioloskipregled.org.rs/2018/06/04/socioloski-pregled-vol-lii-2018-no-1/>.

and *Review of Sociology*. It is understood that this analysis remains unfinished and open to modifications with an insight into new results and contributions.

First of all, my elaboration shows that although in science there is no automatism and symmetry between the rhythm of changes in the social ontology of the epoch and changes in spiritual creation (cosmology), i.e. sociological reflection on the critical challenges of the so-called social time (about which Karl Mannheim, Georges Gurvitch, Edgar Morin, Pierre Bourdieu, John Naisbitt, or our authors Vojin Milić, Đuro Šušnjić and Todor Kuljić wrote in their studies in sociology of knowledge), these research studies mostly confirm the hypothesis about the social influence of the ruling tendencies (megatrends) in the social history of the epoch we live in, and sociological reflections on the problems of certain topics. Exactly these topics are dealt with by the majority of the authors in their published papers.

If we accept Gurvitch's *scheme of typology of social time* (published in the study "Contemporary Role of Sociology" in 1965), in which he presents his view on deep sociology and on the sociology as a science of total phenomena/facts, emphasizing that the key social phenomena are simultaneously the producer and the product of social time, then a certain type of freedom is possible only in a certain type of time behind which they hide. His typology can be succinctly presented through *the times of long duration and slow flow* (in which the past rules over the present) and finally *explosive time* (in which radical, discontinuous processes prevail), in which "the time goes ahead of itself" and in which the future that has begun becomes actual. A rough, simplified classification of social time into periods of *evolution, crisis and revolution, into periods of continuity, antagonism and discontinuity* or, according to *Kuhn's paradigm* of the scientific revolution (on the movement from Paradigm 1 through the period of normal science, crisis, to Paradigm 2) points to the reflex logic of megatrends in social time in ontology to the spiritual-cognitive rhythm. This by no means does not imply that the human spirit and Promethean societies cannot make a leap, or show a discontinuity in their development.

The researchers who have processed and quantified the contributions published in the *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* from its renewed appearance in 1961 until today note that in the period 1961-1981 topics related to self-management and changes in the social structure prevail; the period 1981-1990 dwells on the crisis in Yugoslav society; the period 1991-2000 deals with disintegration and conflicts; the period since 2001 to date tackles transition, globalization and the European integration. A closer analysis of the articles published in the journal and sociological valorizations would also reveal the presence of different theoretical orientations and methodological approaches in the author's analysis, ranging from Marxism and functionalism, Structuralism (1961-1990), through conflict theory and geopolitics (1991-2000), all the way to the neoliberal discourse on transition, theories of the world system, dependent modernization and culturalism and postmodern constructivism (2000-2020) (see Antonić, 2021; Trkulja, 2021).

If we make a short, rough review while analyzing contributions and referenced works, we will notice that in the first published issue of the journal *Sociološki pregled /*

Sociological Review (1938) the authors are concerned with the place of sociology as a new science in the system of social sciences; they show us the status of this science in the world, as well as the founders of this science in our country, but they also refer to the abundant literature containing studies on the emergence of fascism in Europe and the world. In other words, one can also observe the first signals of the coming black wave of the future world calamity!

In the period from 1961 to 1970, the contributions are, first of all, dominated by the optimistic spirit of faith in workers' self-management and its emancipatory possibilities, de-Stalinization and liberation of labour/creativity of workers and citizens; from 1970 to 1980, the spirit of normativism prevails in the legal and political sciences, but also criticism of the system (in the spirit of 1968, critical theories), which under the guise of "federating the federation" is deformed into a system of polycentric statism, the formalization of self-governance and its suppression behind pompous rhetoric of the ruling party elite. In the period from 1980 until 1990, a growing crisis, economic, social and political is felt against the background of the rise of the forces of rampant polycentric statism towards the confederation of the country. In this context, the League of Communists of Yugoslavia (LCY) turned from a hegemon and a factor of systemic political integration into an actor of disintegration.

The 1990s were marked by blocked transition, crisis and war conflicts which were induced by separatism from within and geostrategic games of the Western powers from outside. The culmination of these processes was the intervention of NATO forces in the FRY in 1999 and the changes of 5 October 2000.

The period 2000-2010 is at the heart of the euphoria of the neoliberal ideology of the transition of society, economy and numerous institutions of the welfare state. There was insufficient concern for state sovereignty and insufficient involvement in the so-called Kosovo issue which escalated with secessionism in the conditions when the province was under the patronage of the United Nations (UN). *It was as if multi-party interests in fighting at the top of the political elite came before the preservation of the sovereignty of the Serbian state.*

The period 2012-2022 is marked by the continuation of neoliberalism in the economy and attempts at neo-statistical intervention to get out of the crisis, the rise of the Serbian Progressive Party as a massive mastodon party that swallows up and subjugates all others in a coalition. All this has numerous repercussions on development and blocks the processes of the current democratization of the country.

In this context, one can note that higher education has also been destroyed by the Bologna reform. Under the guise of globalization and European reform, we have ended up with the fragmentation of education and scientific systems. We are faced with the marginalization of social sciences and humanities and the devaluation of their role in society.

The analysis of the bibliographic units and thematic blocks which were published in the monograph *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review 1938–2020: Bibliography* in

Belgrade in 2021, as well as of the papers published in the journal “*Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review*” no. 1/2018, points to the fruitful balance of creativity of our sociologists but also to the skilful editorial policy, openness to theoretical pluralism and departure from dominant dogmatic tendencies and attempts of imposing censorship on this journal in the conditions of one-party socialism.

In the period 1938-2020, as many as 86 thematic blocks and 27 thematic issues of the journal *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* were published, encompassing a wide range of topics that cover numerous disciplines and problem areas from the history of sociology and contemporary sociology. While the first issue of the journal launched in 1938 deals with the relationship between sociology and social sciences, from 1961, the renewed journal will launch the topic of the real essence of Marx’s scheme of the social base and superstructure, the social laws in 1961, the problems of sociology of religion, industrial sociology and social conflicts in 1971. Furthermore, by researching the problems of social structure development in 1981, the topics of the crisis of Yugoslav society and labour strikes in 1986 and 1987 were covered. The early 1990s also covered the breakup and disintegration of Yugoslavia in 1994; the transition of Yugoslav society in 1996, 2004; then the history of the development of sociology in Serbia (there were three anthologies edited by S. Antonić (2012), One hundred years since the birth of Yugoslavia, edited by S. Miladinović (2018), Transition: thirty years later, Thematic block on demography, edited by M. Rašević (2019), Society in COVID-19, edited by Vladimir M. Vuletić, Society and Media, edited by Z. B. Jevtović (2020).

SOCIOLOŠKI PREGLED / SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW WITH NEW TASKS IN STORE – A LOOK INTO THE FUTURE

An overview of the historical odyssey of the journal *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* indicates that it has experienced a successful flight. Regardless of a certain interruption in its presentation, the journal underwent renewal, thematically expanding to new problem areas of sociological disciplines, as well as personnel renewal, expanding the circle of its collaborators from new generations of sociologists. For such reach, we should thank both the editors and the members of the editorial staff of this journal, as well as the collaborators who donated their contributions to this journal for the benefit of the academic community of sociologists in our country.

Bearing in mind the turbulent times or challenging processes that new generations of sociologists will face, it is necessary to make a possible prediction in the form of a view of the future of this journal and its further active role in contemporary sociology. In this line, the following is to be expected:

- greater focus of the journal on problems and challenges, contradictions of transitional practice in our country and in the world; that is, the scope and balance of the transition of dependent modernization in post-socialist societies;

- critical review of the concepts and practice of the strategy of development and management in our country;
- consideration of the comparative experiences of other Balkan countries in transition;
- presentation of new theoretical and methodological orientations and achievements in contemporary sociology;
- publication of critical reviews of the best papers from domestic and international sociological literature;
- opening to the creativity of the new sociological generation in our country, critical evaluation and critical valorization of its contribution;
- monitoring the creativity of the new Serbian intellectual diaspora and preserving its cultural identity, encouraging its return mobility as well as their inclusion in the partnership for the development of Serbia;
- affirmation of the importance of regional and international connection and cooperation of sociologists in the Balkans, Europe and the world. Special monitoring of the work of associations, journals, international academic cooperation in education and scientific research activity of sociologists as part of the community of Homo academicus;
- sociological valorization and affirmation of the engaged role of the calling of sociology and sociologists in the world and in our country as well.

Bearing in mind all the above-mentioned factors and other academic and social topics, sociology and sociologists should cultivate critical distance, especially towards current processes in current politics, taking into account the warnings of wise philosophers and sociologists: “All knowledge is worthless if it does not make a person better” (Socrates); “Everything that is real is not mental, everything that is mental is not real” (Hegel); “Sociology is a martial discipline and cannot be indifferent and neutral towards the problems concerning man and the possibilities of humanity” (Bourdieu); “In sociology, the search for truth must never be separated from the search for the paths of Goodness, Freedom and Justice” (Wallerstein).

The journal *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* has survived numerous ups and downs, “children’s diseases” in its development and has stayed on its feet. We wish it a successful further flight and a dignified stance in the years to come, in meeting new challenges and generations whose time is approaching.

We congratulate the editors and the editorial staff who, with their responsible work, helped the journal to persevere and affirm the calling of sociology and sociologists in our country, as an academic, scientific, moral and martial discipline “in Bourdieuan sense”:

that one cannot be neutral in the issues and struggles that are of decisive importance for the development of our society and the future of humanity.

REFERENCES:

- Antonić, S. Č. (2018). The foundation of *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review* in 1938, *Sociološki pregled* 52 (1). 7-23. DOI: 10.5937/socpreg52-17319
- Antonić, S. Č. (2021). Six decades of renewed *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review*. In B. Vukotić, D. Aranitović *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review 1938–2020: Bibliography* (681-705). Beograd: Srpsko sociološko društvo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5652094> [In Serbian]
- Lukić, R. (1992). Preface. In: Đorđe Tasić, *Discussions on the philosophy and theory of law*. Beograd: Pravni fakultet u Beogradu i Dom kulture “Studentski grad”. [In Serbian]
- Mitrović, Lj. (2011). *Geoculture of the development of the Balkans and contemporary sociology*. Novi Sad: Prometej. [In Serbian]
- Mitrović, Lj. (2022). Creation of the study group for sociology in the mirror of the comparative analysis of the development of sociology in Serbia. *Godišnjak za sociologiju*, 28, 71-89. DOI: 10.46630/gsoc.28.2022.04 [In Serbian]
- Tasić, Đ. (1938). Sociology and Action, *Sociološki pregled*, Book One, 166–172. Available at <http://www.socioloskipregled.org.rs/2017/08/15/socioloski-pregled-vol-i-1938/> [In Serbian]
- Tasić, Đ. *et al.* (1938a). Editorial, *Sociološki pregled*, Book One, 3–10. Available at <http://www.socioloskipregled.org.rs/2017/08/15/socioloski-pregled-vol-i-1938/> [In Serbian]
- Trkulja, J. (2021). Bibliographic contribution to the study of the journal *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review*. In B. Vukotić, D. Aranitović *Sociološki pregled / Sociological Review 1938–2020: Bibliography* (706-714). Beograd: Srpsko sociološko društvo <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5652094> [In Serbian]
- Vuletić, V. and Stanojević, D. (2013). Social topics of the first decade of the 21st century - Comparative analysis of Serbia - Croatia, *Sociology*, 1, 47-68. [In Serbian]